



Library of the Theological Seminary,  
PRINCETON, N. J.

---

Division..... I  
Section ... 7  
Shelf.....  
Number.....





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2015

THE  
Jewish Expositor,  
AND  
FRIEND OF ISRAEL.

---

AUGUST, 1818.

---

ON THE MESSIAHSHIP OF JESUS  
CHRIST.

*To the Editors of the Jewish Expositor:*

Gentlemen,

AMONG the many prejudices existing in the minds of the Jewish nation against the divine character and Messiahship of our Lord Jesus Christ, there is none which seems more deeply rooted, than that one which is founded upon the supposed unprofitableness of his mission to that people, among whom his personal ministrations were exercised.

In the writings of David Levi upon the prophecies, this objection is perpetually recurring. It, indeed, pervades the whole of his three volumes with little variety of feature. Thus he observes, in vol. i. p. 137, "As Christians freely acknowledge that the Messiah belongs to the Jews, it must astonish every impartial, candid, and liberal mind, when it considers how inefficacious his (Jesus's) appearance was to them. For it is clear from all history, that

he was so far from being endued with the power of bestowing on them the good they had just reason to expect from the prophecies of the Old Testament, by accomplishing the great promises made to them, that they, on the contrary, a few years after, according to the prediction of Daniel, saw their temple burnt, their chief city destroyed, and their country laid waste, &c. ; so that it is plain he brought them nothing but misery and shame, which is a demonstration that he could not be the Messiah."

Now it ought not to be denied by the Christian who is anxious to win over his Jewish brother to the truth as it is in Jesus, that there is at least an appearance of considerable force in this objection. It must be admitted that there is a deep mysteriousness in all the ways and operations of the Almighty; nor does it seem easy for human reason to reconcile the circumstance of the personal ministry of the Lord Messiah having been

exclusively exercised among the Jews, with the fact that his church has hitherto consisted chiefly of Gentile converts, while the great body of that people to whom he was especially sent, have continued strangers to all the blessings which were freely offered to them in those days, when Jesus of Nazareth preached among them the glad tidings of salvation, saying, *Repent ye and believe the Gospel.*

In considering subjects so replete with difficulty, we are, as it were, impelled to use the language of a prophet and an apostle,—“*Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed him the way of understanding?*”\*—“*O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? or who hath first given to him and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things, to whom be glory for ever. Amen.*”†

In endeavouring to remove the objections of our Jewish brethren, which are founded on the circumstance of their

long-continued estrangement from the covenant of the Messiah, it will therefore be expedient to lay aside the feeble light of human reason, as wholly insufficient to guide our feet through this dark labyrinth of Divine Providence, and to apply our minds to the diligent observance of the ways of God with his ancient people, from the time of the calling of Abraham to the present day. By this mode of investigation, it is probable that we shall be enabled to show that the difficulty in question possesses no peculiarity of feature as applicable to the Christian dispensation, and that the same objection might have been urged in ancient times, to the Divine procedure towards Israel under the Old Testament economy.

On a reference to the history of Abraham, we find it recorded in Gen. xiii. 14. *And the Lord said unto Abram after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever.* Now if we inquire into the date of the promise, of which the above words were merely a renewal, we shall find it was first given about one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one years before Christ, and thus we discover that three thousand seven hundred and thirty-nine years have elapsed, since God said that he would give the land of

\* Isa. xl. 13, 14.

† Rom. xi. 33—36.

Canaan to Abraham and his seed for ever. If we further inquire into the manner in which the promise has actually been fulfilled, we shall learn that God did not see fit in his adorable wisdom to begin giving effect to it, until four hundred and thirty years after it was originally given, and that through the obstinate unbelief of the children of Israel, forty years more elapsed before they entered the promised land. Again, from the period when they were actually put in possession of the land under Joshua, until the leading away captive the ten tribes by Shalmaneser king of Assyria, there was a period of *seven hundred and thirty years*, which is the whole length of time that Israel, as a nation, has possessed the land of promise, from the calling of Abraham to the present day, being less than one-fifth of the interval of *three thousand seven hundred and thirty-nine years* already mentioned.

With respect to Judah, they possessed the land *eight hundred and sixty-three years* before their captivity in Babylon, and from the proclamation of Cyrus for their return in the year 536 before Christ, until the final destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in the year of Christ 70, a further interval elapsed of *six hundred and six years*; but during a great part of the period last mentioned, the Jews can scarcely be said to have possessed the land, as they were exposed

to bitter and dreadful sufferings from the nations who ruled over them.

The sum of what we have said, therefore, amounts to this, that out of the whole period of 3739 years, which have elapsed since the promise of God to give the land of Canaan to Abraham and his seed for ever, the whole nation have possessed their inheritance only for the period of *seven hundred and thirty years*, and Judah has dwelt in it, if we include the whole interval between the commencement of their return from Babylon, and their final dispersion by the Romans, during the space of *one thousand four hundred and sixty-eight years*, being little more than *one third* of the period which has elapsed since the promise made to Abraham.

The following table contains the dates of the different events above mentioned, and may be useful to show at one view the chronological arrangement of the history of Israel, from the calling of Abraham to the present day.

	Years before Christ.	Years. of Christ.
Date of the original promise to Abraham, which was renewed in Gen. xiii. 14. . . . .		1921
From thence to the exodus from Egypt . . . . .	430	1491
From thence to the entrance into Canaan . . . . .	40	1451
From thence to the captivity of the ten tribes . . . . .	730	721
From thence to the captivity of Judah in Babylon . . . . .	133	599
From thence to the decree of Cyrus . . . . .	52	536
From thence to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans . . . . .	606	70
From thence to the present year	1748	1918
Sum total of years from the original promise to Abraham		3739

Now let us suppose that an infidel holding a disputation with a Jew, were, from the circumstances above mentioned, thus to reason, "That the alleged promise of God to Abraham is absolutely inconsistent with the facts of the case; and as we cannot conceive that God, after having made a promise, should so far deviate from the performance of it, we must necessarily conclude that no such promise was ever made, and consequently, that Moses has recorded that which is not true, and his pretensions to divine inspiration fall to the ground." What reply would the Jew make to this cavil? Would he not say that God had been strictly faithful to his word, by giving possession to Israel of the promised land; but that Israel had been unfaithful to his God, and had, on that account been cast out of his inheritance; and to this cause, and no other, is to be ascribed the unprofitableness of the divine promise to Israel during the whole period of their dispersions.

It cannot but be obvious to the candid and impartial inquirer, that the objection quoted from the pages of David Levi at the beginning of this paper, to the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth, admits of a similar reply as that which we suppose the Jew to give to the cavil of the infidel. That the great body of the Jewish nation have not hitherto derived any benefits from the mission of Jesus, is attributable to the

same causes as have led to their expulsion from the land of Canaan. Jesus the Messiah appeared among them as a preacher of righteousness, and invited them to receive all the benefits of his salvation. But they rejected the message of peace, they crucified the Lord of glory, and continued deaf to the voice of his apostles, who after his ascension into heaven preached repentance and the remission of sins in his name, to those very persons who a short time before had cried, *Away with him! Away with him! Crucify him! Crucify him! his blood be on us and on our children.*\* It certainly is a just matter of wonder, that a people who possessed such signal spiritual advantages, should have made so perverse a return for them; but then it is no more wonderful that they should have rejected the Lord Messiah, than that they actually (as acknowledged by themselves) rebelled against the Lord their God in the wilderness, and proposed to appoint a captain to return into Egypt.†

Indeed it merits the serious consideration of the unbelieving Jew, that it appears, from various passages of their own Targums, particularly Onkelos on Numb. xi. 20. that the Lord whom they rejected in the wilderness was the WORD of JEHOVAH, *ימראת*, the very same Divine Person who, ac-

\* John xix. 15. Matt. xxvii. 25.

+ Numb. xiv. 4.

cording to the testimony of the writers of the New Testament, became incarnate in the humanity of the Lord Messiah. Now if their own Targums testify that they rejected the Word of Jehovah in the days of Moses, why should it appear incredible that they again refused to receive him when he appeared in the flesh?

It is manifest, therefore, from what has been said, that there is no real force in the objection which forms the subject of these observations; and that Jew will be condemned by his own Scriptures, who shall for this reason continue to deny the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth.

I am, &c.

W. C.

in the Infinite Essence, a plurality, of what are commonly called persons, not separately subsisting, but essentially belonging to the Godhead, which persons are commonly termed Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." The tenth article restricts the filiation of the second person to his incarnation, and denies his Sonship in respect of his distinct subsistence in the Godhead: "His human nature was begotten of the blessed Virgin Mary, through the creative energy of the Holy Ghost,—but his divine nature, because God, infinite and eternal, is uncreated, undivided, and unbegotten, which, were it otherwise, he could not be God in any proper sense of the word; but as he *is* God, the doctrine of the eternal Sonship must be false;" whilst the 7th article states, "That in due time the divine Logos, *called afterwards*, the Son of God, &c. became incarnated." My first remark is, that the second person in the Infinite Essence was called the Son, not afterwards, as Dr. Clarke pronounces, but *before*, very *long* before the incarnation. The second Psalm is decisive on the subject, "Kiss the Son:" and it appears to stand in connection with the Jehovah of the preceding verse, "Serve *Jekovah* with fear, and rejoice with trembling; kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way when *his* wrath is kindled but a little; blessed are all they that put their trust in *him*."

#### REMARKS ON THE DIVINE SONSHIP OF CHRIST.

To the Editors of the *Jewish Expositor*.

Gentlemen,

SHOULD the following remarks on the subject of *the divine Sonship* of Christ suit your purpose, your early insertion of them will very much oblige a constant reader of your invaluable work,

EXONIENSIS.

Dr. Adam Clarke, at the conclusion of his work on the New Testament, has drawn up thirty-two articles, as expressive of those "doctrines or principles," which he believes to be "the truths of God." The second article asserts the doctrine of the Trinity,—"That there is,

My second remark is,—That if his Sonship is to be restricted to his “ human nature, begotten through the creative energy of the Holy Ghost,” then, although our Lord may very properly be called the Son of *God*, inasmuch as the blessed Spirit that produced his humanity is God, yet it does not appear that, in this respect, he could possibly be called, as he is, “ the Son of *the Father*.” If the relative term Son refer solely to his being begotten, as to his human nature, by *the Spirit*,—then it cannot apply to the *first* person in the Godhead as *his Father*, but to the *third*, the acknowledged agent in the miraculous conception; and in reference to this, Christ is plainly called the Son of *God*,—“ The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, therefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God :” but this does not in any way account for the established order of the glorious Trinity, “ in the name of *the Father*, and of *the Son*, and of the Holy Ghost ;” where the filial title relates to the first subsistence, and not to the person of the third.

My third remark is,—That Dr. Clarke mistakes the question, when he says, of the Son, that his divine *nature* is undervived and unbegotten; for this does not appear to be the contested point, all parties acknowledging the absolute self-existence of the Divine Nature, Essence, or Godhead: but is the Son, as a distinct person or

mode of subsistence in the Divine Nature itself, in no sense derived nor begotten? In making the statement he does, it is natural for Dr. Clarke to conclude, that “ the eternal Sonship must be false.” But had he inquired, respecting his personality, whatever name it bear, Logos, or Son, or the Hebrew Dabar or Memra, it would have led him to declare, that the eternal Sonship must be *true*. Suppose him to have been eternally “ the Divine Logos,” or Word, according to Dr. Clarke’s idea expressed in the seventh article of his creed, is he, *as such*, undervived and unbegotten? Is not the *Word* as much a relative term as the *Son* is? If thought is the *conception* of the parent mind, what is word but the *birth* of the mind? Every way, then, the second mode of subsistence is, in relation to the first, what the Alexandrian Clemens calls him, “ the genuine Son of the Divine Mind.” Indeed the term Son is the most appropriate designation of his Divine Person, since it expresses so unequivocally a sameness of nature and perfections,—it implies universal identity, with the sole exception of a distinction of personal subsistence; but the term *Word* may rather refer to “ his goings forth ” in counsel, and covenant, and so on, which are said to “ have been from of old, from everlasting,” or, as the margin has it, “ from the days of eternity ;” it may likewise refer to his agency in creation, since,

in one place we read, that by "the Word of Jehovah were the heavens made," and in another, that "he *spake*, and it was;" and again, "he *commanded*, and they were created." I am aware of the objection made to his Sonship, that it implies priority of existence on the part of the Father, and subsequence of existence on the part of the Son; but surely such ideas are futile in the extreme, since they are utterly inapplicable to the modes of subsistence, whatever names they bear, in that Infinite Essence, Nature, or Godhead, which is at once self-existent and eternal. Mr. Drew's reasoning, like that of Dr. Clarke, militates equally against the terms word of God and image of God, because it might be as plausibly contended for, that the term *word* includes a relative idea, implying a priority of existence in the parent *mind*, whose thoughts and intents the word divulges; and that, with respect to *image*, the thing represented is prior to that which represents it, as substance is to shadow, or an original to the copy, or the seal to its impression made on the wax. But perhaps we have more suitable illustrations, in mind and thought,—in the sun and its ray,—light and its effulgence, and so on,—because these are at once *co-eval*, and of one and the same *nature*. Thought is to be considered, as well the express image of the mind, or peculiar form of it, as its legitimate conception; the mind,

naturally operating within itself, naturally conceives,—and this conception is its own form or likeness, and its own nature; it is mind of mind: now if a heathen could say, of the *human* mind, "Forma animi aeterna,"—"The form of the mind is eternal;" how much truer is this declaration when applied to the *divine*? And therefore we have a right to conclude, that the doctrine of the eternal Sonship *must be true*.

My fourth remark is,—That in the front of John's Gospel, although in reference to creation, he is called "the Word," yet, in relation to the first mode of subsistence, he is called "The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father,"—and the glory of the Logos is explained as being "the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father;" indeed, throughout the writings of John, the Father and Son are represented as *en to Theion*, one Divinity, in a duality of persons,—nor can I imagine how any spiritual mind should err in this, after a close investigation, in particular, of John x. 28—38, in connection with John v. 17—26. Not that the proof of his Sonship is confined to John; St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, gives thanks "unto the Father, who hath translated us into the kingdom of *his* dear Son, who is," *as such*, "the image of the invisible God," that is to say, *in the form of God*, as the same apostle expresses it to

the Philippian church, and so *equal with God*, and, as Zechariah states it, the *fellow*, or the *equal by nature*, of God the Father. Hence he is “the First-born of the whole creation,” or the *Heir Apparent* of the universe of worlds. All that the Father has, is by inheritance the Son’s; it is his birth-right, in virtue of his being the First-born. And that he who is thus the End, Omega, or final Cause of all, might likewise be the Beginning, Alpha, Origin, or First Cause of all; therefore *the Son* is, in a peculiar sense, the *Maker* of all; whence the apostle introduces his account of this with a *for*; he is the heir of every creature, “*for by him* were all things *created*; all things were created *by him*,—and *for him*,—and he (this Son, and Heir, or First-born), *is before* all things,” that is, eternal: consequently, the doctrine of the eternal Sonship *must be true*. The same apostle, in his Hebrew Epistle, confirms us in this important point: in the first chapter “*the Son*” is described as “heir of all things;” as the agent “*by whom the worlds were made*,”—as “*upholding all things by the word (or mere fiat) of his power*;” as being “*the brightness of glory, and the express image of*” essential Deity, and, as the *Son*, an object of adoration even to the angels,—“*as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they*,”—the name of Son; for, in proof of this, it follows,—

“*For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? But, unto the Son (the Father saith), Thy throne, O God!* is for ever and ever: and thou, in the beginning, hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands; they shall perish, but thou remainest; they shall be changed, but thou art the same.” In the third chapter, it is allowed by Dr. Clarke to be the apostle’s design to represent him as God, “*He who built all things*;” and, to regulate the affairs of so vast a fabric, he is said to preside, but especially over his church, “*as a Son over his own house*.” In the seventh chapter, Christ, as Priest, is said to be made *like to Melchisedec*; but, in respect of Melchisedec being described as without “beginning of days,” in this *higher* point Melchisedec *himself* is said to be “*made like unto*,” or to be a faint shadow of, “*the Son of God*,” who, as the substance of the typical Melchisedec, is *truly* without commencement of being, “*the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever*.”

I shall conclude these brief remarks, by demonstrating the truth of the disputed doctrine from the express statements of Dr. Clarke himself. In his comment on the Hebrews, to illustrate the expression, “*the brightness of his glory*,” he adopts the explanation of Hesychius, as given in Parkhurst’s Greek Lexicon, who interprets

*ap-augasma*, or brightness, by the *light* or *splendour* of the sun; and this is countenanced by that in the book of Wisdom, “the brightness of the everlasting light.” To this Dr. Clarke subjoins, that “the word *augasma* is that which has splendour *in itself*,” whereas “*ap-augasma* is the splendour *emitted from it*; but the inherent splendour and the exhibited splendour are radically and essentially the same.” This is pretty nearly the language of Parkhurst, who derives *ap-augasma* from the verb *ap-augazō*, “to emit or eradiate light or splendour,” and Englishes it by “light or splendour emitted or eradiated,—eradiation, effulgence.” Now, from this borrowed definition of “the brightness,” as a something emitted by, and proceeding from, the *doxēē* or “excellent *glory*,” and this, in allusion to the divine person of Jesus, what is to be inferred, unless the *Sonship* of Jesus, his derivation, generation, or procedure? The *augasma*, or splendour *emitting*, answers to the divine person of the *Father*; and consequently the *ap-augasma*, or splendour *emitted*, cannot but answer, with the utmost exactness and propriety, to the divine person of the *Son*: for “as the *Father* hath life in himself, so hath he given to the *Son* to have life in himself;” and hence, “as the *Father* quickeneth the dead, even so the *Son* quickeneth whom he will.”

But, to proceed. “From  
VOL. III.

these words,” says Dr. Clarke, “it is evident, 1. That the apostle states Jesus Christ to be of the same essence with the *Father*, as the *ap-augasma*, or *proceeding splendour*, must be the same with the *augasma*, or *inherent splendour*.” But how is the second mode of subsistence in God of the same essence with the *Father*, and as it were, a proceeding splendour from an inherent one, except as he is the *Son* of that *Father*, and the *offspring brightness* of that *Parent Glory*?

Dr. Clarke’s 2d inference is, “That Christ, though proceeding from the *Father*, is of the same essence; for if one *augēē* or splendour, *produce another* *augēē* or splendour, the produced splendour must be of the same essence with that which produces it:” to which I would subjoin, that, if one splendour produce another, and the producing splendour is called the *Father*, then, the *produced splendour* must inevitably stand in the relation of a *Son* to that which produces it.

His 3d inference is, “That although Christ is thus of the same essence of the *Father*, yet he is a distinct person from the *Father*; as the splendour of the sun, though of the same essence, is distinct from the sun itself; though each is essential to the other, as the *augasma* or inherent splendour, cannot subsist without its *ap-augasma*, or proceeding splendour, nor the proceeding splendour subsist without the inherent splendour

from which it proceeds." But if the *produced* subsistence proceed from the *Father*, is of the same essence or nature with the *Father*, and a distinct *person* from him, what is this personal production of the *Father*, but the *Son*? And if of the same essence, then this *Son* is eternal; or, if not eternal, he is not of the same essence, of which eternity is a natural and a necessary perfection. But if the *Son* is not eternal, neither is the *Father* so, for they are allowed to be of one and the same essence; they must be *co-eval*, like light and its ray, or the sun and its splendour; each is essential to the other, nor can they subsist apart: hence an apostle says, "he is Antichrist, that denieth the *Father* and the *Son*. Whosoever denieth the *Son*, the same hath not the *Father*; but he that acknowledgeth the *Son*, hath the *Father also*."

Dr. Clarke's 4th inference is this: "That Christ is eternal with the *Father*, as the proceeding splendour must necessarily be co-existent with the inherent splendour; if the one therefore be uncreated, the other is uncreated; if the one be eternal, the other is eternal." But surely this is an egregious mistatement, in an explanation of Eternal Deity, to say, "that *Christ*," instead of, "that the *Son*, is eternal with the *Father*." A period was fixed upon in *time*, according to Daniel, "to anoint the Most Holy," in order that he, who was, as the *Son*, eternal with

the *Father*, might, upon becoming incarnate, be anointed with the Holy Ghost, and so be constituted the *Messiah*, the *Prince*, the *Christ*, of God. Is *Christ* a relative term, implying co-existence with the *Father*? Is there any necessary connection the one with the other? Will it at all follow, that because the *Father* is eternal, the *Christ* is eternal? Is there aught of nature or of essence in the title of *Christ* or *Messiah*? or is it not altogether official, a title characteristic of his regal, prophetic, and sacerdotal appointments? But the name of *Son* is that more excellent name which *angels* may not aspire to, in the sense in which it is applied to the second person in the Godhead, as "the only-begotten of the *Father*." Yet this fundamental error pervades the Doctor's statements; the Sonship is studiously excluded, as though it were an intolerable doctrine of Popish origin, as some, I understand are fond of insinuating. In all his four inferences, the Doctor connects, not the *Son*, but *Christ* with the *Father*. "Christ is of the same essence with the *Father*;"—"Christ proceeds from the *Father*;"—"Christ is a distinct person from the *Father*;"—"Christ is eternal with the *Father*." But is he wiser than Paul? Rather, I should ask, is he wiser than the Spirit of wisdom? Now Paul is speaking, and the Spirit is testifying, in the scripture in question, of the *Son*: God hath spoken to

us in these last days “ by the Son ;” or, in the person of the Son, which Son he hath appointed heir of all things, by which Son also he made the worlds, which Son is the brightness of his glory.” And therefore, correctly, the Doctor should have said, that “ the Son is of the same essence with the Father ;”—“ the Son proceeds from the Father ;” “ the Son is a distinct person from the Father ;”—“ the Son is eternal with the Father, as the proceeding splendour must necessarily be co-existent with the inherent splendour ; if the Father therefore be uncreated, the Son is uncreated ; if the Father be eternal, the Son is eternal :” for, if the one proceed from the other, and if that other from whom that one proceeds is called the Father, and is eternal,—then the one proceeding cannot be *undervived* and *unbegotten*, but must, as a distinct person, or mode of subsistence, infallibly be the derived, the begotten, “ the Son of the Father ;” and therefore the doctrine of the eternal Sonship *must be true.*”

I cannot refrain from subjoining an extract from the Rev. John Oxlee on the Trinity, in reference to the Sonship ; “ We affirm the second subsistency of the Godhead to be the Son of God, and God personally so called, to be the Father of that Son ; but in this we assert nothing which is not equally implied in Jehovah and his Word. To the Jew it cannot be unknown, that in

the sacred dialect, *any product, or effect whatever, may be termed a Son* ; so that, with Moses, the growth of a year is called “ the son of a year ;” and with R. Moses Kimchi, a word of four letters is called “ a son of four letters ;” the parts of speech, also, are denominated “ the sons of speech.” Contemplating, then, the wisdom or word of Jehovah, as an *effect* of the Divine *Mind*, (and R. Moses Botril has truly remarked, that “ whether we will or not, wisdom *must proceed from mind*,”) the Christian is justified in naming that effect the Son, the only-begotten Son ; or, as Clemens of Alexandria expresses it, “ the genuine Son of the Divine Mind ;” and, the Divine Mind itself, or Jehovah, the *Father* of that Son,—as these, like mind and wisdom, are correlative terms, the consideration of the one necessarily exciting always the consideration of the other. That this is the light in which *the fathers* regarded the subsistency of the Son, is apparent from Origen, who flourished early in the third century : “ Surely, in admiring the Son, who is reason, wisdom, truth, and righteousness, and whatever else we may have been taught to consider so divine an offspring, we are honouring the Father. We, who have been taught to understand what the Son of God is,—that he is the fulgurancy of his glory, the character of his substance, the stream of the power of God, the pure pro-

manation of the glory of the Almighty, the resplendency of the eternal Light, the unspotted mirror of the energy of God, and the reflection of his goodness, — are sensible that such a subsistency must be *the Son of God*, and that God must be his Father. Neither is there, in this language, any thing unbecoming, or unworthy of the Deity, when we assert the subsistency of an only-begotten Son ; nor will any one be able to persuade us, that a Being like this, is not actually and truly the Son of the unbegotten God."

I beg to finish this hasty sketch with a few appropriate quotations from the Hebrew Scriptures, and also from the works of the early fathers, by which it will fully appear, that we are every way countenanced in the idea of the *Sonship* of the Second subsistency in the Godhead; notwithstanding that, in our day, it is a doctrine which is almost "every where spoken against." It has been already hinted, that, to call an effect or product, of whatever kind, a *Son*, is a common usage with the Hebrew writers. The Margin of our larger English Bibles, if attentively consulted, will afford abundant examples of this description. Both men and angels are (Beni) sons of the Alehim, "for," as Paul speaks, "we are also *his offspring* ;" only, by creation, not as "begotten." The young of beasts and birds have the same appellation: in the first of Leviticus, at the 5th verse,

"the bullock" in the Hebrew is called (Ben), "the Son of an ox ;" and, at the 14th, for "young pigeons," the Hebrew has it "of the sons (Beni) of the pigeon." It is employed, in truth, from whatever proceeds from, or is produced by, another thing, or that has any sort of reference or relation to something else, as will be seen in the succeeding instances. In the twelfth of Exodus, at the 5th verse, a lamb "of a year old," is, literally, "a son of a year ;" which is making the offspring exactly *co-eval* with that of which its filiation is predicated ; since the lamb, which is called *the son of one year*, is precisely *one year old*. In the 1st of Samuel (xiii. 1.), for "Saul reigned one year, the Hebrew is, "Saul, the son of one year in reigning ;" a valiant man is literally "a son of valour ;" (xviii. 17.) persons worthy of death are "the sons of death." (xxvi. 16.) In the fifth of Job, at the 7th verse, "the sparks" are, "the sons of the coal," or, "of the burning coal ;" and in the forty-first chapter, at the 28th verse, an *arrow* is described as "the son of the bow." In the fourteenth of Isaiah, at the 12th verse, Lucifer, or Satan, is called the "Son of the morning," being created with the first dawn of Time, whence, perhaps, the angels are styled "the morning stars" in the book of Job ; and the threshed corn is called in Isaiah, (xxi. 10.) the "son of the floor," as the produce of it. In Lamen-

tations (iii. 13.) the arrows are called "the sons of his quiver;" and, to adduce but one instance more, the anointed ones in Zechariah are called "the sons of oil." (iv. 14.) Hence the New Testament has its Boanerges, "Sons of Thunder;" and its Barnabas, or "Son of Consolation;" also, Son of Peace, Son of Perdition; and, in Matthew (xxi. 5.) "a colt, the *foal*," is, in the Greek, "a colt, the son."

From these examples, it is manifest, that, whether we speak of the second mode of subsistence as "proceeding" from the Father, as "produced" by him, or "emitted," or "exhibited,"—all which expressions are employed by Dr. Clarke,—we are authorized in distinguishing its divine personality by the title of *the Son*; more especially as it declares, more explicitly than any other, an identity of essence and perfections, and thus establishes his proper deity; on which account the adoption of this obnoxious term was what uniformly enraged the infatuated Jews, who said, "We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself *the Son of God!*" For this, in their esteem, was "blasphemy,"—it was arrogating to himself "an equality with God;" nay more, the instant he had said, "I and the *Father* are one," they prepared to stone him, "Because that thou, being a man, makest thyself *God!*"

Happily, in confirmation,

we are able to trace this doctrine up to the earliest fathers of the Christian Church, even to the apostolic age. The authorities about to be produced will all be *prior* to the famous Council at Nice, convened in the year 325; as, at that important juncture, it was universally acknowledged that the doctrine of the eternal Sonship was determined, after the maturest deliberation, to be Scripturally true. And it is pleasing to reflect, that the instant Arius broached his novel idea, "that if the Father begat the Son, he who was begotten must have a beginning of his existence, and hence it is manifest that there was a time when the Son was not;" it was immediately condemned, and the Son was declared to be at once co- eternal and consubstantial, and of the same dignity with the Father. Nor is it a little gratifying, that the Waldenses, who are generally allowed to have been exceeding "incorrupt in doctrine, even in the most corrupt ages of the church, give their verdict in our favour; "We believe, say they, "that there is *one God*, Father, *Son* and *Holy Spirit*:" "We believe that Jesus Christ is *the Son*, and *Image* of the *Father* ; we believe in the *Holy Spirit*, as the *Comforter*, proceeding from *the Father*, and from *the Son*."

I shall commence with Hermas, who, being mentioned in the Romans, connects us at once with the apostolic age:— "The *Son of God* is, indeed,

more ancient than any creature, insomuch that he was in council with the *Father* upon the subject of creation." Again, "The name of the Son of God is great and without bounds, and the whole world is supported by it." And Barnabas, who is named in the Acts, (iv. 36.) calls him, "The Lord of the whole earth, to whom he (the Father) said, the day before the world was finished (ante constitutionem seculi,) " or "before the appointment of time, Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness;" which proves the Son to have been Creator conjointly with the Father, since it is said, *We will make, or create*, which is the prerogative of *Jehovah* alone, and therefore it follows, in *our image, our likeness*, it being one and the same, or, "the image of God."

Ignatius, the disciple of St. John, remarks, that "There is one God, who has manifested himself through Jesus Christ his *Son*, who is his *eternal Word*;" which is but the echo, indeed, of what St. John had taught; for having said that "the *Word* was *God*," and "all things were made by him," and that the *Word* was made flesh," he then explains it "as of the *only-begotten* of the *Father*;" and adds, "no one hath seen *God* at any time, the *only-begotten Son*, who is in the bosom of the *Father*, he hath declared him." The last act recorded of this "man of exemplary piety," as Mr. Jones

describes him, "and in all things like to the apostles," is, that before being delivered to the wild beasts to be devoured, "All the brethren at Rome kneeling down with him, he (like another Stephen,) prayed to the *Son of God*, in behalf of the churches." His pastoral advice in one of his epistles is, "Study to be confirmed in the doctrines of the Lord and his apostles, that in all things which ye do, ye may have good success in flesh and spirit, in faith and love; in the Son, and the Father, and the Spirit."

Polycarp, who was also a disciple of St. John, and suffered about the middle of the second century, is described as saying, at his death, "O *Father* of thy beloved and blessed *Son*, Jesus Christ, I bless thee, that thou hast counted me worthy of this day and this hour, to receive my portion in the number of martyrs, in the cup of Christ, for the resurrection to eternal life both of soul and body; in the incorruption of the *Holy Ghost*;" whilst those who witnessed his death, and gave account of it, say, for themselves, "It is not possible for us to forsake Christ, nor ever to worship any other, for we adore him as being the *Son of God*."

Athenagoras, a Christian philosopher at Athens of the second century, affirms of the Son, that, "By him, and through him, were all things made, the Father and Son being one; the Son being in

the Father, and the Father in the Son, in the unity and power of the Spirit." Again he says, " We preach the Father to be God, the Son to be God, and the Holy Ghost; who manifest their power in unity, and their distinction in order." And again, " Christians make it their business to know God and his Word; what is the unity of the Son with the Father, what the community of the Father with the Son, what is the Spirit; what is the unity or oneness of these, who are so many, and what is the distinction of these, who are one; *The Spirit, the Son, the Father.*"

Justin Martyr wrote about the year 140, not more than eighty years after the time of the apostles: he intimates that the Lord " existed before all time, being God, *the Son* of the Maker of the universe, and was made man of the Virgin." In his *Apology* to the Emperor he says, " We are named Atheists, but not with respect to the most true God, the Father; him and the Son and the prophetic Spirit, we worship and adore; honouring *them* in word and in truth." On the eighth of proverbs he observes, " The discourse of wisdom shall bear me witness, that he who is God, begotten of the Father of the universe, is the Word, and the Wisdom, and the Power, and the Glory, of him who begot him." He asserts, that the Son is generated of the Father, " as one flame is from

another, the original blaze communicating of its own substance, without suffering diminution, even though it has kindled a blaze equal to itself." He refers those expressions in Genesis, " Let *us* make man," and " The man is become as *one of us*," to the persons in the Godhead.

Irenæus flourished in the second century, " If any shall say to us, How then is the Son generated of the Father? we answer him, that, whether we call it procedure, or generation, or expression, or utterance, or disclosure, or by any other denomination, no man, neither the angels, nor the archangels, nor the principalities, nor the powers, nor any other, knows his unspeakable generation, besides the Father alone who begat him, and the Son who was begotten;" which, indeed, is what himself says, that " no one knoweth *the Son*, but the Father; neither knoweth any one the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." Irenæus calls him " the Son eternally co-existent (semper co-existentis) with the Father;" and he adds, that the Scriptures testify these things of him, that he alone had in himself a glorious generation from the most high Father, and accomplished a glorious birth of a virgin." He further says, that " Man was fashioned after the image and likeness of the uncreated God; the Father willing his creation, the Son ministering

and forming him, the Holy Ghost nourishing and increasing him."

Theophilus of Antioch, who was Bishop of that see about the year 170, first introduced the expression of "the *Trinity*;" for the three modes of subsistence in the Divine Essence; to whom he applied the names of "God, the Word, and the Wisdom," conceiving these, as most descriptive of their essence, to be preferable to those simpler ones, founded on relations of "the Father, Son, and Spirit." However, that by "the Word" he intended the second person, is plain from Athenagoras, before noticed, who, writing to the Emperor, says, "If it should occur to you to enquire, whence it is that he (the Word, or Logos) is called a *Son*, I will explain it in few words. It is, that he is, to the Father, as the first offspring, or, according to Paul, "the first-born." Not as something made: for God, being an Eternal Intelligence, himself from the beginning had the Logos in himself, being eternally rational." He is explaining why the second person is called the Son; that it expresses a relation which the second person stands in to the first, who is called the Father; which relation is that of the eldest born. Lest this should lead to the notion of a *physical* generation, which would sink the Son into the rank of a creature, he says that the birth of the Son is not to be understood

as if his being had ever commenced at any certain time, because his actual existence is from eternity; this, he says, is the necessary consequence of the confessed eternity of the Father. The Logos had existed from eternity, in union with the Father, "because God, being eternally rational, ever had the Logos in himself." The argument rests on a principle, common to the Platonic fathers, that the existence of the Son flows necessarily from the Divine Intellect exerted on itself; from the Father's contemplation of his own perfections: but as the Father ever was, his perfections have ever been, and his intellect has been ever active. But perfections which have ever been, the ever-active intellect must ever have contemplated; and the contemplation which has ever been, must ever have been accompanied with its just effect, the personal existence of the Son. It is to be observed, that Theophilus explains "the beginning of the creation of God," as referred to the second person in the Revelation of John, (iii. 14.) and which has given rise to so much error, about the pre-existence of the human soul of Christ, and so on,—he explains it thus,—"The Word is called the beginning (*arkēē*), because he commences, or originates (*arkei*), and governs, all things that were made by him." Again he says, "In the beginning God made the heaven," that is, "The hea-

ven was made by him who is the beginning (*dia tees arkees.*.) Now a Jewish Rabbi is witness that " *Jehovah* is truly *the beginning* and the *cause* of all existences," according to Abraham Ben David. Indeed the Platonists well observe, that " To a beginning there is no origin, because *from a beginning* all things must arise, whilst itself cannot possibly be adduced from any other thing; it could not be a beginning, were it begotten or produced any where out of itself." And hence the application of *alpha* and *omega*, the first and last letter, to the Omnipotent; " I am Alpha and Omega, (the beginning and the ending) saith the Lord God, who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty." (See Griesbach, Rev. i. 8.)

Clement of Alexandria wrote towards the end of the second century: he says that Christ " was from all eternity the Word of God;" and that, " being in the form of God, he thought it not robbery to be *equal with God.*" He calls him " God the Word, the Instructor;" — " the Son, existing or begotten, without commencement (*anarkōōs genome-nos,*)" and says, that " The only-begotten Son is the only God;" not, is *only*, or alone, or by himself, the true God, which would go to exclude the other persons; but, is *the only* true God, according to John, (xvii. 3.) which is equally true of *each* person, as alike participant of the common Godhead,

VOL. III.

whence it is said of *the Son* by John, " This (person) is the true God." 1 John v. 20. He speaks of the three as " A Trinity indivisibly divisible," and implores the Word and the Father distinctly in prayer, and then adds, " O Lord! Son and Father, both one, grant that, night and day, even to the day of consummation, we may with praises return thanks, and laud the only Father and Son, the Son and Father, together with the Holy Ghost, in all things one, in whom are all things." Again, " We have a treasure in earthen vessels, on all sides fortified by the power of God the Father, and the blood of God the Son, and the dew of the Holy Ghost." The blood of God the Son may refer to the Acts (xx. 28.) " The church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood;" and which reading, (says Mr. Lee) " receives greater support from the ancient versions, than has generally been supposed." (Church Missionary Report, 1817.)

Tertullian was converted to the faith about the year 185, and died early in the succeeding century. In his treatise against Prænas, who, like our modern Sabellians, denied the distinction of persons in the Godhead, he speaks of the Trinity in unity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, yet *one God*, and speaks of the Lord Jesus as both Son of Man and *Son of God.* This account of him is quoted from Milner by Mr. Jones, in his Waldensian His-

Q Q

tory, in which every one must see the eternal *Sonship* of the second subsistence in God very plainly declared; and yet, in the face of this of Tertullian, who wrote about the year 200, Mr. Jones will have it, that “the doctrine of eternal generation was unknown to the inspired writers, and unquestionably hatched in the school of Alexandria.” He refers to the affair of Alexander and Arius, which happened about the year 315, and gave rise to the Nicene Council in the year 325. But so far from this doctrine of the Sonship originating with Alexander in 315, it was taught by Tertullian, according to Mr. Jones himself, at least a hundred and fifteen years before, not to mention the preceding authorities already quoted in this paper. It is only to contrast the creeds of Alexander, in 315, and of Tertullian in 200, or thereabouts, to shew their coincidence, and to prove that so far from introducing a novel tenet, Alexander, in asserting the doctrine of the divine Sonship, only followed the opinion of his predecessors in the church of God. According to Mr. Jones, Alexander, in 315, had asserted “an unity in the Trinity, and that the Son was co-eternal and consubstantial, and of the same dignity with the Father.” According to the same writer, Tertullian, in about the year 200, “defended with great clearness and ability, the doctrine of the revealed distinction in the Godhead,

against Prancas, who had propagated sentiments subversive of the Christian faith. In that work he treats of the *Trinity in unity*,—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,—yet one *God*: of the Lord Jesus Christ, as both *God and man*,—as at once the *Son of Man*, and the *Son of God*; and this he describes as the “rule of faith which had obtained from the beginning of the Gospel.” What words can more strongly enforce, I will not say, the eternal *generation*, if any one dislike that *term*, because mere terms are not worth contending for; but what words can more strongly enforce the eternal *Sonship* of the second mode of subsistence than those of Tertullian? He asserts, says Mr. Jones, the *Trinity in unity*, that is, three distinctions in one *God*; the distinctions are, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and *these* are “one *God*”; nor is this all, for he is described as asserting of the incarnate Word, that he is “both *God and man*”—but how? As being at once “the *Son of Man*,” and “the *Son of God*;” that is to say, he is *man* as the *Son of man*, being born, as all the sons of men are, of a woman; and he is *God* also, as the *Son of God*, or “the only-begotten of the Father.”

Tertullian’s idea will appear equally clear, from the following quotations from his writings: “The washing away of offences is an acquisition made by faith, sealed and witnessed by the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit.” He says, Christ

is “ called the *Son* of God, and *God*, from oneness of *substance*;” and he exemplifies this identity of substance by the light of the sun, which emits in every ray it sheds forth; “ the sun will be in the ray, because it is a ray of the sun, nor is the substance separated, but extended.” — “ I testify, that the Father and Son and Spirit are undivided one from another: *two* indeed we define the Father and Son, and, with the Holy Ghost, *three*; two Gods, however, and two Lords, we have never named; not as if the Father were not God, and the *Son* God, and the Holy Ghost God, and each of them God: but I every where hold *one substance*, in three co-hering together.” In reference to Genesis (i. 26. and iii. 22.) he asks, “ Did he speak to angels, as the Jews interpret, because they do not acknowledge the *Son*? or did God speak *plurally* to *himself*, because he was Father, *Son*, Spirit? Yea, for this reason.” “ What is the office of the Gospel, what the substance of the New Testament, which establishes the law and the prophets; if not that from thence, these three, the Father, the *Son*, and the Spirit, are to be believed to be *one God*? ” “ Where there is a second, there are two, and where a third is, there, there are three: but the Spirit is a third from God and the *Son*, as the fruit from the stem is a third from the root; a stream from the river a third from the spring, or fountain-

head: and a gleam from the ray a third from the sun.”

Origen was born in the year 185, and died in 254. “ We adore,” he says, “ the Father of truth, and the Son who is truth, being two in person, but, in consent of mind, and identity of will, one.” “ The Son of God is God the Word;— the Son is incomprehensible, inasmuch as he is God the Word.” “ You confess one God, and, in the same confession assert, that the Father, and the *Son*, and the Holy Ghost, are one God. There are some, indeed, who make profession of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but not sincerely, nor according to truth: such are all heretics, who either falsely divide the Son from the Father, by declaring the Father to be of one nature, and the Son of another; or else they falsely confound, by thinking God a compound of *three natures*, or, only a *trinal name*. But he who makes a good confession, ascribes to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, their respective peculiars, yet professes, that there subsists no diversity of nature or of substance. We worship and adore no creature but the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The true faith acknowledges one sole God (*ena kai monon Theon*), in a holy and consubstantial Trinity (*omo-ousiōō*). Moreover, as there is but one fountain of Godhead in this Trinity, none is afore or after other, none is greater or less than another. Sure I am, that these

things are not to be comprehended, except, prostrate and suppliant, we implore *the Word himself*, who is the only-begotten Son of God."

Pamphilus, a Presbyter of Cesarea in the third century, suffered under Diocletian in the year 303. He says of Origen, that he held, that "The Son was begotten of God the Father, and is of one substance with the Father, but alien from every created nature: therefore the only-begotten God our Saviour alone, was generated of the Father, and is his Son by nature, and not adoption, but sprung from the *Paternal Mind itself*." "Whatever is said of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, must be understood to extend above and beyond all time, all ages, and even all eternity; for this Trinity alone is it, which exceeds, not only what can be measured by time, but whatever our limited intellect can conceive of eternity."

Gregory Thaumaturgus died in 264. His creed was this,—"There is one God, the Father of the living Word, the Father of the only-begotten Son. There is one Lord, God of God (Theos ek Theou), the effectual or energetic Word, the creative Power by which all things were made, the true Son of the true Father, eternal, of him who is eternal. And one Holy Ghost, having his subsistence of God; the cause of life to the living, the Holy Fountain, the Author of sanctification, by whom God the

Father is made known, *and God the Son*. A perfect Trinity, undivided, and inseparable one from another, in glory, and eternity, and dominion."

Cyprian was chosen Bishop of Carthage in 248. He observes, that "Christ himself commands the nations to be baptized in the full and united Trinity, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." "Inasmuch as these three are one, (1 John v. 7.) how can the Holy Spirit be in amity with him, who is the enemy of either the Father or the Son?" In his Tract on the Unity of the Church, he observes, "The Lord says, I and the Father are one;" and again, concerning the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, it is written, "And these three are one." (1 John v. 7.)

Novatian wrote about 240. There is extant a Treatise of his on the Trinity, "one of the most regular (says Milner) and most accurate, that is to be found among the ancients. It is astonishing that any should ascribe the ideas of the Trinity mainly to the Nicene Fathers. We have repeatedly seen proofs of the doctrine from the apostles' days, being held distinctly in all its parts. This Treatise of Novatian may be added to the list. I don't know how to abridge it better, than to refer the reader to the Athanasian Creed. The Trinity in unity, and the Godhead and Manhood of Christ in one person, are not more plainly to be

found in that Creed, than in this contemporary of Cyprian."

Firmilian, pupil of Origen, and contemporary of Cyprian, calls baptism "a symbol or confession of the Trinity." He advises "invoking the Trinity, and calling upon the names of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit;" and adds, "Let us rest assured, that our concord and brotherly love, and being agreed concerning the unity of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is an acceptable sacrifice to God."

Dionysius of Alexandria died in 264. He defended the truth against Sabellianism. In the small remains of this work, it appears, that he held the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, and he described the Trinity in unity, equally steering clear of the rocks of Sabellianism which confounds the persons, and that of Arianism which divides the substance. "The Father," said he, "cannot be separated from the Son, as he is the Father, for that name at the same time establishes the relation: neither can the Son be separated from the Father, for the word Father implies the union." He was also the author of the following doxology: "To God the Father, and to the Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, together with the Holy Ghost, be glory and power, for ever and ever, Amen."

In 264, a council was held, to consider the opinions of Paul of Samosata, at which they

were condemned as heretical, and he recanted; but at a second council he was deposed, in 269. They declared the Son "from all eternity to be in substance and in person God;" and objected to Paul, that "he refused to acknowledge the Son of God to have come down from heaven."

Dionysius of Rome, dying in 269, was succeeded by Felix, who, in an Epistle to Maximus of Alexandria, says, "We believe that our Saviour Jesus Christ, was born of the Virgin Mary; we believe that he himself is the eternal God and the Word, and not a man whom God hath taken into himself; for the Son of God, being perfect God, was also made perfect man, being incarnate of the Virgin."

Theognostus, towards the end of the third century, defended the Son's consubstantiality with the Father; "For as the sun," said he, "is not diminished, although it produce rays continually, so likewise the Father is not diminished in begetting the Son, who is his image." And Dionysius of Rome, before mentioned, in a letter written by him in the name of the Roman Synod, proves that the Word was not created, but begotten of the Father from all eternity. He also distinctly explains the mystery of the Trinity.

After these numerous testimonies, it will be vain for any one to date the origin of the Divine Sonship, or, of the Trinity in unity, so late as 315,

when Arius and Alexander had their debate, since all the authorities produced above, are prior to that era, and reach up, indeed, even to the apostolic age, demonstrating the points contended for, to have been at once the sentiments of the Christian Church, and those of the Sacred Scriptures. I need add no more, but an acknowledgment due to the authors quoted or referred to,—as Milner, Horsley, Burgh, Jones, and Oxlee, and perhaps one or two more, not now recollected.

—.

### LECTURE TO CHRISTIANS ON JEWISH SUBJECTS.

#### THE NECESSITY OF THE ACCESSION OF THE JEWS TO THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, TO THE PERFECTION OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM.

*Eph. i. 22, 23. And gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.*

THE text is the conclusion of a prayer, which the apostle assures his beloved Ephesians that he addressed to the throne of mercy on their behalf. It expresses the continual desire of his soul for them, ver. 15, 16. Read the whole of the prayer. Its object is, "that they might have higher and more comprehensive conceptions of the Gospel, and of its glorious author as raised from the dead, and exalted to supreme dominion in the heavenly world.

In the more immediate con-

text the apostle enlarges on the glorified state of the Divine Mediator, a subject full of unspeakable comfort to those who have reason to hope that they have an interest in him; since it affords them assurance that he is able to save to the uttermost, &c.

In discoursing on the words which I have selected, I shall

1. Make some general remarks on the subject here presented to our notice.

2. Consider it in relation to the special object of the present lecture.

1. To make some general remarks, &c.

The text divides itself into two general views—The view which it gives of the Lord Christ as *the head* of the church,—and that which it gives of the church as *His body*.

The relation in which Christ stands to his church as the head, is a most delightful subject for believing meditation. The view given is metaphorical, and is borrowed from the constituent parts of the human frame. The head is distinguished from the members, as it is the seat of dignity and authority, and the source of vital influence. But it is closely and indissolubly united to them by a conformity of nature, and an identity of object. Thus all dignity and authority are vested in our spiritual head, the Lord Jesus Christ; and all vital influence is derived from him to every believer. But he is one with them as a partaker of the

same nature; and the same object (his mediatorial glory, which is to result from the welfare of his church,) occupies his mind and that of every converted sinner.

When the apostle says that he is head over all things, &c. he means to point out, either his supremacy over the whole creation for the benefit of his church (Ps. viii.); or that fulness of blessing, which it hath pleased the Father should dwell in him: or perhaps the apostle might intend to shew, that the suretyship pre-eminence of Christ was the principal object which God had in view in all his dispensations,—in creation, providence, and grace.

The church is the body of Christ. Now a body is composed of many members, who are all united to each other, and to one head. On this union with the head, all vital existence entirely depends. Hence all life, strength, sense, and motion, flow. (1 Cor. xii. 12, &c. Col. ii. 19.) Hence arises the obligation to love and obedience which the church owes to Christ; and hence the brotherly love which the members of the same body owe mutually one to another.

The spiritual constitution of the Christian church is the result of divine appointment and efficiency. God the Father, after that he had raised the Lord Jesus from the dead, and had set him, &c. (ver. 20, 21.) “gave him to be head over all things to his body the church.” He had fulfilled, by the obe-

dience of his life and death, the terms of the everlasting covenant; he was thereby qualified for the suretyship eminency to which he was destined; —he possessed, as Mediator, an official ability to save to the uttermost, &c.—his twofold nature; his atonement, righteousness, and grace; his sympathies and experience; his personal trials and sufferings; all conspired to fit him for the high and momentous destination which he was to fill.

Let us adore the mercy of God in this gracious appointment.

Let us study and admire the dignities and qualifications of our glorious head.

Let us live entirely on his fulness, and submit ourselves implicitly to his will.

Let us make his glory our aim and end, by the promotion of that object which lies nearest to his heart.

The church is further described in our text as “the fulness of him that filleth all in all.” The church is *the completion* of Christ, as the body and limbs are of the head. As the head is not complete without the body, so neither is Christ without the church. O how great the condescension of the Son of God, to place, as it were, himself in such a situation, that sinful worms, recovered by himself to peace and holiness, should be represented in his own word as essential to his completion. How unutterably sweet is the train of meditation to which this representa-

tion leads us! How unchangeable and great the love of Christ! How secure the state of every believer in him! how honourable his character as a member of Christ, and as essential to the totality of that body of which he is the glorious head! Hence the church sometimes takes the name of Christ her head, as 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13. Gal. iii. 16.

Lest the condescension of Christ should cause us to forget the dignity of his nature; lest the material comparison should lead the mind off from the deity of him, who as God-man is made head over all things, &c.; the apostle takes care to remind us that the head over all things to his church is that Being who filleth all in all. No phraseology could be used more unequivocally to describe the godhead of Christ. As the material efflux fills nature with its influence; so Christ by his Spirit fills his church with grace and glory. As the vital influence of the head, in the body natural, extends to the lowest member; so grace flows from Christ and filleth all in all. Indeed he filleth all places, for he is omnipresent. Were we to ascend into heaven, he is there. (Ps. cxxxix. 8.) He filleth heaven with happiness and glory, earth with grace, and hell with horror. He filleth especially all his members with light and life and love. He filleth all ordinances with the blessings they convey; prayer with prevalency, preaching with its efficacy, and praise

with the delight it affords to the believing soul. From his fulness we receive, &c.

But I must not enlarge on this delightful subject, as it is not the appointed scope of the present lecture. I therefore proceed,

2. *To consider the subject of our text in relation to that particular object.*

The subject then of the present lecture is "*the necessity of the accession of the Jews to the Christian church, to the perfection of Christ's kingdom.*" The thesis should have been differently worded; instead of the Jews, it should have said of Israel; for it is to the twelve tribes, and not to the single tribe of Judah, that the promises relate. Rom. ii. 26.

The word *εκκλησία*, or church, has different senses,—sometimes it signifies an individual church, or assembly of professing Christians living in one place, and meeting in one assembly;—sometimes it is used as comprehensive of the whole number of the church militant here on earth, or those of every nation, &c. who profess the name of Christ;—and sometimes for the church triumphant now in heaven. In its largest sense it comprises the whole number of the elect, as saved and glorified in Christ their head, at the last day. The general assembly or church of the first-born. In our text the word is to be taken in this its most comprehensive interpretation.

Now the church of Christ, in this comprehensive sense, is in

our text compared to the human body. The component parts of the human body are not variable, but fixed in their number. It consists of a head, and its several members. If either of the members be wanting, the body is mutilated and imperfect. The mystical body of Christ will in the great day be complete; and if, according to the predictions of Scripture, Israel is to be incorporated with the Gentiles, a point not now to be proved, their accession is essential to the perfection of Christ's mystical body.

Another scriptural emblem of the Christian church is a temple or sacred edifice, dedicated to the true God; or rather, the temple at Jerusalem is the emblem employed. And with this view it is that St. Peter says, Ye (believers) as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house. Now the constituent parts of the temple at Jerusalem were, 1. The temple, properly so called, consisting of the holy place, where the priests officiated, and the sanctuary, or holy of holies, where the shekinah resided, the former exhibiting what Christ was to be, to do, and to suffer, upon earth; and the latter, what he was to be and to do in heaven. 2. The appendages to the temple, properly so called, were the court of the people, *i. e.* of the Israelites, and the court of the Gentiles. And if the temple afford a competent emblem of the Christian church, that church must consist of the same component parts. And it is, perhaps, with

this spiritual reference that Ezekiel, at the close of his prophecy, and St. John, at the close of his Revelation, have given a minute description of the material temple.

The relation between Christ and his church is often illustrated in Scripture by the marriage union. It is unnecessary to refer to the various passages wherein this illustration is employed; but it is important to our present object to remark, that where it is used for the purpose of exhibiting the *general character* of the Christian church, as redeemed and brought into a state of union with her Lord, Israel is the bride, and the several Gentile churches are her maidens or companions. (So Ps. xlv. 13, 14, 15.) Perhaps the Song of Solomon may be best interpreted by maintaining the same distinction between the Jewish and Gentile churches.

In the scene laid in the seventh chapter of the Revelation of St. John, the 144,000, the representatives of the church of Israel, who are described as sealed, appear to me to be distinguished from the great multitude which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds and tongues, the Gentile nations, whom St. John saw standing before the throne of God and of the Lamb. For the apostle says, "After this, I beheld, and lo, a great multitude." It was a distinct object which was presented to his view.

In the descriptions which are given of the latter-day glory of

the Christian church, under the notions of a mountain exalted above the hills, and a magnificent city, *that* mountain is Mount Zion, and *that* city is Jerusalem, and these emblems, constantly, I conceive, refer to the church of Israel. The hills on which the mountain stands, and the suburbs of the city, are the churches of the Gentiles; and the visitors of the city are the Gentile converts who are to crowd into her, when her walls are built and her gates thrown open. By these emblems a superiority of character is constantly attributed to the church of Israel. I can refer but to a few passages; Isa. ii. 2, 3. "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Mic. iv. 1, &c. Isa. ix. throughout, and Rev. xxi. 2. 24, &c. In like manner, in Rev. xx. 8. the camp of the saints seems to be distinguished from the beloved city.

While these allusive views bear on the subject to which our attention is called, "The necessity of the accession of Israel, &c." there is one passage of the apostle to the Eph-

sians, chap. ii. 15. to which I would more particularly call your attention. The apostle is speaking concerning the introduction of the Gentiles to the church of God before existing in the world. In speaking on this subject he contemplates the Jews and Gentiles as two distinct bodies, which by the Gospel were to be united so as to form *one new man*.\*

Now the only question that can arise is this, whether the in-gathering of the *apostolic era* can be considered as a fulfilment of the prophecies which abound on this subject, as a satisfactory solution of the magnificent emblems which we have noticed, and of others which might be produced. If the

\* The argument which perhaps most clearly shews the necessity of the restoration of Israel to the perfection of the Messiah's kingdom, lies in the connection which prophecy establishes between the restoration of Israel, and the final and grand in-gathering of the Gentiles. These magnificent events are stated to be linked together, and the former is represented as the instrumental cause of the latter. Israel, in a converted state, is spoken of as "the dew of heaven," and "the showers upon the grass of the field." Let us remark the prayer of the ancient church, still used in our own. (Ps. lxvii. 1. &c. Isa. xi. 10. &c.) Other passages might be quoted.

If, then, the conversion of the Jews be implicated by the covenant of mercy, and its revelation by the harp of prophecy, with the general in-gathering of the Gentiles, no doubt can remain that the former is essential to the perfection of Christ's kingdom. Indeed the wisdom of God hath so interwoven these golden threads in the texture of its complex scheme, like the warp and the woof in the loom of the material manufacturer, that the one is as essential as the other to the perfection of the robe of glory, in which the attributes of Deity will be eternally clothed, when the manifold wisdom of God, the πολο ποικιλος σοφια, shall be displayed.

spiritual temple is to consist of a court for Israelites as well as one for Gentiles—if the church of Israel be like a mountain seated on many hills representing Gentile churches—if it be a city and those churches its suburbs—if the new man, the body of Christ, the fulness, &c. is to consist of two constituent parts united in one;—it should seem as if the number of the elect from among the natural seed of Abraham, should bear *some* proportion to those who are called from other nations.

It is impossible to ascertain the number of the converts from Judaism to Christianity, who were made during the apostolic era; but how many soever they were, they must have been very few compared with the numbers of the Gentile church, or with the numbers of Jews who have lived and died in unbelief, since the judicial destruction of their city and commonwealth, and their last dispersion. The contemporary number of the Jews, so called, (independent of the unknown millions of the Israelites of the first captivity) is, I believe, about ten millions. The generations in eighteen centuries, taking thirty years for a generation, are sixty. If we multiply sixty by ten, the amount of the Jews who have lived and died, since the coming of Christ, will be six hundred millions. Of these, after the apostolic era, very few indeed have been converted to the Christian faith. Awful is the retrospect!—But the prospect brightens before us,—“Blind-

ness in part is happened unto Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; till the Gentile monarchies shall have been fulfilled; and so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, (Isa. lix. 20.) There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.”—“O the depth of the riches, &c.” This epistle of the apostle is dated by our chronologists in the year of Christ 60, after, perhaps, the greater part of the first-fruits of the Jewish nation had been gathered in; but it speaks of a time of harvest then to come, which certainly has not yet arrived—and how glorious will that harvest be. Should there be no increase in the contemporary numbers of the Jews during the millenial state, (but who can calculate how vast the probable increase will be) and without taking into the account the now unknown tribes of the first captivity, which will then be restored to their brethren, and brought in to the Christian church together with the Jews: ten millions only of contemporaries will, in the generations of one thousand years, amount to ten thousand millions. O what an accession to the church of Christ!! How much of glory yet remains to be added, in order to make up the predetermined fulness of **HIM** that filleth all in all!

The final in-gathering of Israel is, (Rom. xi.) called by the apostle “*their fulness*,” an expression which I conceive refers to some appointed limit.

There is a fulness of the Gentiles and a fulness of the Jews, which together make up the fulness of him that filleth all in all; both are necessary to complete his kingdom. With a reference to this fulness, our church has taught us to pray over the remains of her members, that it may please God shortly to accomplish the number of his elect and to hasten his kingdom.

This is a wide and glorious subject, to which little justice can be done in the time afforded for a pulpit address. I must commend it to your meditations. Think of the future glory of the church.

" Oh scenes surpassing fable, and yet true,  
 Scenes of accomplish'd bliss! which who can see,  
 Though but in distant prospect, and not feel  
 His soul refresh'd with foretaste of the joy?  
 Rivers of gladness water all the earth,  
 And clothe all climes with beauty; the reproach  
 Of barrenness is past. The fruitful field  
 Laughs with abundance; and the land, once lean,  
 Or fertile only in its own disgrace,  
 Exults to see its thirsty curse repeal'd.  
 The various seasons woven into one,  
 And that one season an eternal spring,  
 The garden fears no blight, and needs no fence,  
 For there is none to covet, all are full.  
 The lion, and the libbard, and the bear  
 Graze with the fearless flocks; all bask at noon  
 Together, or all gambol in the shade  
 Of the same grove, and drink one common stream.  
 Antipathies are none. No foe to man  
 Lurks in the serpent now: the mother sees,  
 And smiles to see, her infant's playful hand  
 Stretch'd forth to dally with the crested worm,  
 To stroke his azure neck, or to receive  
 The lambent homage of his arrowy tongue.

All creatures worship man, and all mankind  
 One Lord, one Father. Error has no place:  
 That creeping pestilence is driv'n away;  
 The breath of heav'n has chas'd it. In the heart  
 No passion touches the discordant string,  
 But all is harmony and love. Disease is not: the pure and uncontaminate blood  
 Holds its due course, nor fears the frost of age.  
 One song employs all nations; and all cry,  
 " Worthy the Lamb, for he was slain for us!"  
 The dwellers in the vales and on the rocks  
 Shout to each other, and the mountain tops  
 From distant mountains catch the flying joy;  
 Till, nation after nation taught the strain,  
 Earth rolls the rapturous hosanna round.  
 Behold the measure of the promise fill'd;  
 See Salem built, the labour of a God!  
 Bright as a sun the sacred city shines;  
 All kingdoms and all princes of the earth  
 Flock to that light; the glory of all lands  
 Flows into her; unbounded is her joy,  
 And endless her increase. Thy rams are there;  
 Nebaioth,\* and the flocks of Kedar there;  
 The looms of Ormus, and the mines of Ind,  
 And Saba's spicy groves, pay tribute there.  
 Praise is in all her gates: upon her walls,  
 And in her streets, and in her spacious courts,  
 Is heard salvation. Eastern Java there  
 Kneels with the native of the farthest west;  
 And Æthiopia spreads abroad the hand,  
 And worships. Her report has travell'd forth  
 Into all lands. From ev'ry clime they come  
 To see thy beauty and to share thy joy,  
 O Sion! an assembly such as earth  
 Saw never, such as heav'n stoops down to see."

COWPER'S TASK, BOOK VI.

\* Nebaioth and Kedar, the sons of Ishmael, and progenitors of the Arabs, in the prophetic Scripture here alluded to, may be reasonably considered as representatives of the Gentiles at large.

It will arm you against the effects of imperfection and opposition under which it now labours.

It will stimulate you to exertion in promoting its progress.

It will encourage you in prayer.

It will exalt and purify your own souls.

bride and bridegroom are conducted to the place appointed for the celebration of the ceremony. The bride is escorted by women, and the bridegroom by men. The company is generally large, including most or all of their friends and acquaintance. Ten men, at least, must be present; or the marriage is null and void. The chief rabbi and chassan of the synagogue form part of the company.

A velvet canopy is brought into the room, and extended on four long poles. The bride and bridegroom are led to their station under this canopy; the bridegroom by two men; and the bride by two women, her face being covered with a veil. These two men and two women are always the parents of the bride and bridegroom, if they happen to be living: otherwise this office is performed by their nearest kindred; a man and his wife for the bride, and another man and his wife for the bridegroom; though the bridegroom is led by the men, and the bride by the women. The parties are placed opposite to each other, and then "the person who performs the ceremony, takes a glass of wine in his hand, and says: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe! who createst the fruit of the vine. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe! who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast forbidden us fornication, and hast restrained us from the betrothed, but hast permitted us those who

#### EXTRACTS FROM "MODERN JUDAISM."

##### MARRIAGE.

MARRIAGE is accounted the indispensable duty of every Jew. The time which the rabbies have assigned as the most proper for discharging this obligation, is the age of eighteen; and men who remain in celibacy long after are considered as living in sin. Polygamy is sanctioned by the Talmud, and is sometimes practised by the Jews in the east; but has long been discontinued among their brethren in Europe.

When a marriage is agreed upon, the promise is made before witnesses; which is called *betrothing, or espousing.* (Matt. i. 18.) The parties continue betrothed sometimes six months, sometimes a year, or more, before the union is consummated.

Their marriage ceremonies, in different times and places, have exhibited some unimportant varieties, but the latest of their own writers have given the following general account of them, as performed in this and other countries in the present age.

On the day fixed for the solemnization of the nuptials, the

are married to us by means of the canopy and wedlock. Blessed art thou, O Lord! who sanctifiest Israel.' The bridegroom and bride then drink of the wine; after which the bridegroom takes the ring, and puts it on the bride's finger; saying, 'Behold, thou art wedded to me with this ring, according to the law of Moses and Israel.'

Then the marriage contract is read, which specifies that the bridegroom A. B. agrees to take the bride C. D. as his lawful wife, according to the law of Moses and Israel; and that he will keep, maintain, honor, and cherish her, according to the manner of all the Jews, who honor, keep, maintain, and cherish their wives; and that he will keep her in clothing decently, according to the custom of the world. This instrument also specifies what sum he settles upon her in case of his death; and he obliges his heirs, executors, and administrators, to pay the same to her out of the first produce of his effects.

After the reading of this instrument, the person performing the ceremony takes another glass of wine and repeats seven benedictions. Then the bridegroom and bride drink the wine; after which the empty glass is laid on the floor, and the bridegroom, stamping on it, breaks it to pieces. This part of the ceremony is said to be intended as an indication of the frailty of life. Then all the company shout, *Good luck to you.* The ceremony is followed by a contribution for the poor of the land of Canaan.

The nuptial feast is as sumptuous as the parties can afford, and continues for seven days.

CRITICAL REMARKS ON JER.  
XXIII. 6. AND XXXIII. 16.

To the Editors of the *Jewish Expositor.*  
Gentlemen,

I SEND you some critical remarks on two passages of considerable importance — Jeremiah xxiii. 6. and xxxiii. 16. I am induced to do so, partly by a wish to establish what appears to be the true reading of the Hebrew text, and partly to justify the opinion that both passages confirm the important and fundamental doctrine of the Gospel, the divinity of our Redeemer. The 5th and 6th verses of the twenty-third chapter are as follows. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a **RIGHTEOUS BRANCH**, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and this is his name whereby he shall be called, **THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.**" I will take for granted, what indeed scarcely requires any proof, that these words refer to the Messiah, the Son of David, who is most justly and emphatically characterized as **OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS**—the sole meritorious cause of our justification in the sight of God; and will proceed to a critical examination of the latter part of ver. 6. "And this is his name

whereby he shall be called, **THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.**”\* Dr. Blaney, in his new translation of Jeremiah, has given a different sense to these words from that of our authorized version. It may be proper, therefore, to inquire whether he was sufficiently warranted in making the alteration. He translates the words thus, “And this is the name by which JEHOVAH shall call him, **OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.**” In a note on the passage he says, “Literally according to the Hebrew idiom, ‘And this is his name, which JEHOVAH shall call, **OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS,**’ a phrase exactly the same as, and JEHOVAH shall call him, &c. which, as I have before observed in note on ch. xx. 3. implies that God would make him such as he called him; that is, ‘our Righteousness,’ or the author and means of our salvation and acceptance. So by the same metonymy Christ is said to ‘have been made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. (1 Cor. i. 30.) I doubt not but many persons will be offended with me for depriving them by this translation, of a favourite argument for proving the divinity of our Saviour from the Old Testament. But I cannot help it: I have done it with no ill design, but purely because I think, and am morally sure, that the text, as it stands, will not properly admit of any other

construction. The LXX have so translated it before me, in an age when there could not possibly be any bias of prejudice either for or against the before-mentioned doctrine; a doctrine which draws its *decisive* proofs from the New Testament only. In the parallel passage, chap. xxxiii. 16. the expression is a little varied, but the sense, according to a just and literal translation, is precisely the same; “And this is he whom JEHOVAH shall call, **OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.**”\* Now in the first place I would observe, that admitting Dr. Blaney to have given a correct translation of the *present* Hebrew text, we cannot always rely on that text as indisputable authority. Without a perpetual miracle the Hebrew Scriptures could not have been transcribed so many thousand and ten thousand times without occasional errors. And if we maintain the *absolute integrity* of the present Hebrew text,† besides many similar cases which might be adduced, we must read in Psalm xvi. 10. “Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, neither shalt thou suffer *thy holy ones*, חסידיך, to see corruption,” though upward of a hundred and sixty MSS. and early editions collated by Dr. Kennicott, preserve the genuine reading חסידך, “thy **HOLY ONE.**” Secondly, I would observe, that the dif-

\* Blaney’s Jeremiah, 8vo. edit. p. 334.

† By the present Hebrew text I mean that of Vander Hooght, which is generally considered as the standard.

ference between the present text and that which supports the divinity of Christ, is merely a difference in the position of a single point, which accident or design\* might have easily changed; the respective readings are יְקָרָאֹן and יְקָרָאֹן. In the third place, I must admit with Dr. Blaney that the Septuagint, at least the Vatican and Alexandrine copies, (for I have no opportunity of consulting the various readings,) confirm the present reading יְקָרָאֹן. Yet the Chaldee, Syriac, Vulgate, and Arabic, seem all to have read יְקָרָאֹה: or יְקָרָאֹן לוֹן. "Et hoc est nomen quod vocabunt eum," says the Vulgate, "Deus justus noster." Lastly, we have evidence that the word יְקָרָאֹן with shurek was, and is, extant in some copies of the Hebrew Scriptures, for three MSS. and two editions at least read shurek for

\* See Dr. Owen on the Septuagint, *passim*.

cholem.\* And de Rossi, as he is quoted by Boothroyd, observes, "Plerique Judaorum auctores antichristianii, quorum multi, sive MSS. sive editi apud me extant, in יְהֹוָה צְדָקָנוֹ Messiae nomen agnoscerent non dubitarent. Quodnam est nomen Regis Meissiae? R. Abba filius Caana dicit Jeoah est nomen ejus, quia dictum est, et hoc est nomen ejus quo vocabit cum, vel vocabitur is Dominus Justitia Nostra."+ I shall now conclude for the present: and if you deem these remarks proper for insertion in the Jewish Expositor, I hope to send some observations on Jer. xxxiii. 16. and a restoration of this and its parallel passage xxiii. 6. to what seems to have been the original reading, for insertion in some future number.

KIMCHI.

May 29, 1818.

\* Doederlein and Meisner *Biblia Hebraica* in loc.

+ Boothroyd *Biblia Hebraica* in loc. a valuable work; but greatly depreciated by the numerous errors of the press with which it abounds.

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE LONDON SOCIETY.

### EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM THE REV. C. F. RAMFTLER.

Gnadau, near Magdeburgh,  
May 18th, 1818.

Dear Sir,

IT is due to you and the Society in whose behalf you are actively and officially interested, that I communicate a few particulars in connexion with the views of the London

Society, which I have gathered since my interview with you in London. In Neuwied on the Rhine I had the first opportunity to converse on the subject of Jewish conversion, with Mr. Keetman, a pious and much-respected gentleman, who is the chief agent of the Bible Society in that neighbourhood. Mr. Treschow had already ad-

dressed him by letter. With him I left a copy of the Hebrew New Testament, and of the Prophets, together with various pamphlets inclosed in the parcel of books which the Society has intrusted to me. He noticed that he had entered into a good deal of conversation with a Jewish Rabbi of that place, from whom he learned that the Jews here, and in many parts of Germany, might be divided into three classes; the first consisting of Deists, or Infidels; the second of strict Talmudists, who, like the Pharisees of old, in a punctilious observance of traditions, neglect the weightier matters of the law; and the third of righteous observers of the moral law, who seem to forget the necessity of an atonement for sin. To the question, What sacrifice for the atonement of sin the Jews now trusted in, no consistent answer was returned; the general reply was, that they cast themselves upon the divine mercy, and that bloody sacrifices had only been ordained by Moses accommodating himself to the prejudices of his age. This was the account which the Rabbi gave, who is a well-informed man, but has imbibed the principles of a certain modern divine with application to his peculiar system of faith. Mr. K. lent him Bogue's *Essay on the Truth of Christianity* (I am not sure that this is the correct title of the book); and some days after asked him, whether he had perused it; he replied in

the affirmative, but requested time to read it once more with greater attention. When he returned the book, he declared, with much seriousness, that it had made his mind very uneasy; but though he could not but admit his almost persuasion, he did not know how to forsake his connections, &c. The books which I left with Mr. K. who reads English, will, I am persuaded, be made a profitable use of, and perhaps extracts from them be published in a German translation.

In Frankfort on the Mayn I walked through the street, in which, and its immediate environs, about 8,000 Jews reside. It is a filthy narrow place, with a crowded population. Some opulent Jews, however, live in splendid residences. The street is no more, as was formerly the case, provided with gates, which used to be locked at night, and the Jews enjoy more liberty. Here I visited Senator Van Meyer, who, as Director of the Police with respect to the Jews, is now particularly well acquainted with their situation. He is a man of much learning and no less piety. The greater part of his edition of Luther's New Testament you probably have received before this comes to hand. He presented me with a book, the author of which he is, which I hope in due time to transmit to the Society. His account of the state of the Jews agreed with what I had heard at Neuwied. He added, that

several of the learned Jews, who are employed in teaching youth, are now negligent of the ceremonial law and Talmudical traditions, which with the Jewish multitude is the sum of all religion, and teach their scholars to lay an exclusive stress on moral duties, omitting the peculiar doctrines of revelation. Mr. Van Meyer considers this, though in itself it is no introduction to genuine Christianity, as a circumstance which he hopes will be overruled by a gracious Providence, for divesting the Jews of their absurd regard for outward observances, as constituting the title to divine favour; and that further light may soon convince them of their deficiencies in observing the holy law of God, and thereby prepare their hearts for receiving the atoning sacrifice of Christ. He further mentioned, as a *confidential* communication, that several Jews of distinguished talent in this city, were secretly convinced of the truth of the Christian religion, and only waited for a favourable opportunity (e. g. for encouraging accounts from their converted countrymen, now under the protection of the Society) to declare themselves Christians. Their situation is so peculiar, that their beginning by coming to Jesus in the *night*, like Nicodemus, is perhaps excusable, and they can meanwhile work for good among their nation, without being noticed and anathematized. Another friend told me that the new Hebrew

version of the Gospels which he procured was *purchased* by some Jews, expressly for the use of their children. Some critical remarks on this version by a Rabbi, you have probably received from Mr. Van Meyer. With this gentleman I also left the Hebrew New Testament, the whole of which he had not yet seen, and various tracts.

In Halle I visited the venerable and excellent Dr. Knapp. With respect to the publications of the late Callenberg Institution, which Mr. Leo some years ago purchased here, and which still stand packed up, he gave me some confidential information, from which it appears that *at present* they cannot be removed. This I shall mention to Mr. Nitschke, whom I have not yet seen.

---

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM  
MR. JOHANNES KEETMAN.

*Neuwied, near Cologne,  
April 11.*

I HIGHLY value the attempts made by the Society for the conversion of the Jews, as preparatory to the great event, when the veil of Moses will be removed from the eyes of that nation. But until that event takes place, let us continue, as Buchanan expresses himself, to speak comfortably to Israel, that we may, if possible, win some individuals. In this country, however, the prospect is not very encouraging. The Jews are, like most part of the Christian professors, *merry sin-*

ners; and I found some difficulty in entering upon a serious conversation with any of them, in order to lay before them some of the questions contained in your letter. One, however, a schoolmaster, entered seriously into the matter. He deplored in strong terms the state of religion among the Jews in this country, which even had induced him to address a petition to the Prussian government. They are divided, he said, into three parties. The first of them are complete libertines; the second adhere only to the outward form of ceremonies; but the third, the best of them, submit also to the law of Moses, though with proper discretion. But these are much to be pitied, being ridiculed by the first, and taxed with heresy by the second. Very few among them all are able to read and to understand Hebrew. He did not therefore believe, that the New Testament in Hebrew would be read by many of them; however an attempt could be made with a few copies, as likewise with a few German tracts; and he himself offered to diffuse them among his countrymen. The Karaites he seemed to range among libertines. Finding him to be a sensible and serious character, I asked him,—Where the Jews now applied for consolation and forgiveness of sin, when their consciences accused them of transgressions of the law, as they now lacked the atoning sacrifices ordained by God himself? And how I should

account for the great distress of mind and the terror of death, witnessed by me and others at the dying bed of Jews? But here the freethinker appeared. He declared the atoning sacrifices not at all to belong to the essential part of their religion. The Jews having been slaves in Egypt among Gentiles, where sacrifices of beasts prevailed, Moses thought fit to retain the observance, and thereby to bridle the unruly spirit of the people. In the Psalms God declared himself, that he did not desire sacrifices and burnt-offerings, but only repentance and conversion. And as to the dread of death, he attributed it merely to the revolting lamentations, which attended the last moments and tormented the soul of a departing Jew. I replied, that I considered the sacrifices to be founded on a divine institution, and peculiarly calculated to express the wants of sinful souls. Therefore we read, that already Cain and Abel had brought sacrifices, as likewise the patriarchs, and among them Noah, Abraham, and other true servants and favourites of the Lord. We Christians deem the great atoning sacrifice, offered once for all by Jesus Christ the Son of God, sufficient to encourage the hope of forgiveness of our sins and everlasting salvation. I told him, that there were many among baptized Christians, who did not agree with that truth. For their instruction an English clergyman, Mr. Bogue, had published an

Essay on the Evidence of the New Testament, and that in that work he also had mentioned the wonderful circumstance of the Jews remaining united as a nation, notwithstanding their dispersion throughout the whole earth, during the space of eighteen centuries, whilst many other nations, greater than they, were totally extinguished. He accepted that book, with a view to peruse it. May the Lord be pleased to make it instrumental in opening his eyes, to see and embrace saving truth.

—  
EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM  
THE REV. P. TRESCHOW.

*Stansted Park, June 12, 1818.*

Dear Sir,

You will recollect that my correspondent, Mr. Keetman in Neuwied, in his first letter to me, mentioned a schoolmaster, to whom he lent Mr. Bogue's Evidence, &c. This morning I received a new letter from the same friend, containing the following particulars.

"The Schoolmaster, whose name is —, on returning the book, expressed his great satisfaction, adding, that though it did not take away all the objections of the Jews, he must assure, he never had heard or read any thing so solid, and that he now felt uneasy. In former years Christian scholars had attempted to make him forsake his Jewish creed, in Berlin and in other places; but they had not been able to give

him a better in return. But the case with this book was quite different, &c. I then gave him Mr. Buchanan's Reports from India; and when he the next time paid me a visit, he told me, he was convinced of the truth of Christianity; but for fear of the Jews, and especially of his family, though his wife was of the same opinion with himself, he dared not to confess it. I replied, that *public confession* was, *as yet*, not required; and exhorted him to come, like Nicodemus, by the night to Jesus, and by diligent prayer and reading of the New Testament, to get more and more acquainted with him; if therein he would prove faithful, the Lord in due time would give him opportunity, courage, and strength, to confess him publicly. I made him now a present of the German New Testament, and lent him the Hebrew Testament for his perusal; having, by Mr. Ramftler, on his journey to Saxony, been furnished with a copy thereof."



RESOLUTIONS  
OF A MEETING HELD AT EDINBURGH  
ON THE TWENTY-FIFTH OF JUNE.

We have much satisfaction in communicating the following information from Edinburgh, where the Rev. Legh Richmond has lately been pleading the cause of the Society.

THAT it is the opinion of this Meeting, that it is their duty to promote, by every Scriptural means, the great

and important object of the conversion of the Jews to Christianity.

That with this view a Society be formed in this place, the designation of which shall be, *The Edinburgh Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews.*

That this Society shall use its best endeavours to promote this important object, either by aiding other Societies, or by using direct efforts, as circumstances shall suggest.

That each Subscriber of Half-a-guinea annually shall be a Member.

That each Subscriber of Five Guineas at once shall be a Member for life.

That the following gentlemen shall be appointed Office-Bearers:

*Preses*—Robert Hepburn, Esq. of Clarkington.

*Vice-Presidents.*

Hon. and Rev. Gerard Noel.

Sir Gregory Way.

William Cuninghame, Esq. of Lainshaw.

George Ross, Esq.

*Directors.*

John Abercrombie, Esq.

William Murray, Esq.

Mr. William Maclean.

Dr. Buchanan.

Rev. H. Grey.

Rev. Dr. Peddie.

Rev. Dr. Hall.

Rev. William Innes.

Rev. D. Dixon, jun.

Rev. C. Anderson.

Rev. W. Tait.

Francis Nalder, Esq.

Rev. C. Terrot.

*Secretary.*

James Farquhar Gordon, Esq.

*Treasurer*—Mr. Waugh.

*N. B.* At this Meeting Mr. Legh Richmond addressed them, and a Subscription of £76. was obtained in aid of the London Society.

---

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM  
REV. CHARLES SIMEON.

My Dear Friend,

MR. MARSH and I intended to visit you on our return home from Amsterdam; but our time did not admit of it. The communications we have to make to you on the subject of the Jews infinitely exceed our most sanguine expectations. Verily we have reason to bless and adore our God, for all that our eyes have seen and our ears have heard. The edict of the King of the Netherlands, respecting the education and instruction of the Jews, forms a new era in the Christian Church; and in its probable consequences will be productive of the most extensive benefits to the Jewish people throughout the world. It gave occasion to a sermon of mine which is now published, and spreading throughout the Netherlands in three different languages, the English, the French, and the Dutch. I do not now send you the edict, or state to you the measures adopted in consequence of it, because I think it inexpedient to forestall the communications which Mr. M. and I, if our lives are spared, shall have to make at Norwich and at Bristol: but if the printing of the sermon here will be of any use, I will give it you to be printed

for the benefit of the Jewish Schools.

You must not fail to send regularly to my young friend Mr. Hawkes, who has now the charge of the English Episcopal Chapel at Amsterdam, plenty of the monthly publications of our Society: you will find in him an able co-adjutor, and as willing as he is able. His address is, "The Rev. P. Chevallier's, Keizer Gracht, Amsterdam." By the way, we have not in all Holland,—no, nor even in Eng-

land, a more ardent friend, than that very Mr. C. in whose house he has taken up his abode. Mr. C. preaches both in Dutch and French, and will gladly circulate in those languages the tidings which you transmit to him from time to time. I am, my dear Friend, very affectionately your's,

C. SIMEON.

K. C. July 20, 1818.

P. S. My sermon is entitled, *The Royal Edict.*

To the Rev. Charles Hawtrey.

## P O E T R Y.

### P S A L M . X L V I .

*From an old London Magazine.*

ON God supreme our hope depends  
Whose omnipresent sight,  
E'en to the pathless realms extends,  
Of uncreated night.

Plung'd in th' abyss of deep distress,  
To him we raise our cry;  
His mercy bids our sorrows cease,  
And hushes ev'ry sigh.

What though old earth her seat forsake,  
By pangs convulsive torn;  
Or her self-balanc'd fabric shake,  
And ruin'd nature mourn;

What though th' ungovern'd wild abyss,  
His force tumultuous pours,  
And all his wat'ry legions rise,  
To lash th' affrighted shores:—

What though the trembling mountains nod,  
Nor brave the rolling war;  
Zion secure but hears the flood,  
Loud echoing from afar.

The Lord most high an Zion's hill  
Hath fix'd his sure abode;  
And there his faithful friends shall feel  
The succours of their God.

Then let devouring surges rise,  
And rage on ev'ry side;  
Omnipotence our refuge is,  
And Israel's God our guide.

---

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LONDON SOCIETY.

### AUXILIARIES.

London Ladies,	per Miss Rivington.....	95	13	2
Cambridge,	per Mr. William Hutchings.....	10	10	0

### PENNY SOCIETIES.

Shaftesbury,	per Mr. Jesse Upjohn,			
	Mrs. Wilkins .....	Annual	1	1
Helston,	per Miss E. F. Trevenen .....		3	9
Falmouth,	per Miss Saverland .....		9	0
Wirksworth,	per Miss E. Blackwall .....		6	0
South Collingham and Langford (omitted in last remittance)	....		0	5
Drayton-Beauchamp,	per Rev. B. Woodd.....		7	10

### FUND FOR BUILDING SCHOOLS.

John Keir, Esq. per Rev. C. S. Hawtrey .....	2	2	0	
H. W. Hitchcock, Esq. ....	Annual	2	2	0
E. J. by ditto .....	Donation	10	10	0
Sir Montague Cholmeley, Bart. ....		20	0	0
Ladies' Penny Society at the Chapel .....		23	12	1

FUND FOR BUILDING SCHOOLS—*continued.*

Dividend on £400. Navy 5 per cents.....	10	0	0
Collection at Bentinck Chapel, per Rev. Basil Woodd .....	30	10	0
Boxes at the Chapel doors to 26th July.....	1	10	9

## CONGREGATIONAL COLLECTIONS.

Wrockwardine, near Wellington, Salop, (Rev. John Gilpin) after a Sermon preached by him .....	15	14	0
Brighton, St. James' Chapel (Rev. H. Pearson) after a Sermon by Rev. C. S. Hawtrey .....	22	9	1
Bentinck Chapel, after a Sermon by Rev. B. Woodd .....	31	5	1

## DONATIONS, &amp;c.

Mrs. Mary Gee, Hull, per Rev. John Scott .... <i>Second Donation</i>	100	0	0
Miss Richards, Darowen, Montgomeryshire, collected by her from a few Friends to Israel.....	1	5	0
J. Poynder, Esq. Bridewell Precinct .....	10	10	0
Derby sale of Repository Articles of Ladies' Work .....	14	5	0
Major Bradford, 24, Montague Square.....	10	10	0
Anonymous, per Mr. Seeley .....	1	0	0
Miss Morrice, of Craig, Ayrshire (omitted in June) .....	1	1	0

## HEBREW TESTAMENT.

Greenock and Port Glasgow, West Renfrewshire, Bible Society, per Mr. William Wilson.....	15	0	0
Bentinck Chapel, (Rev. B. Woodd) after a Sermon by Rev. C. Wilks .....	8	11	3
Mr. Friend, Cumberland Street .....	5	0	0
Miss Creasy..... <i>Second Donation</i>	2	0	0
Mrs. Ivison.....	1	0	0
Serjeant-Major Whitehead.....	0	10	6

The Sum of £1. 16s. stated in Expositor for July as from Helston Penny Society should have been as follows—

Miss Harris, Tregarrick .....	0	10	0
Rev. John Rogers, Mawman, H. T.....	1	0	0
Rev. Hugh Rogers, Cambourn, ditto .....	0	6	0

1 16 0



**For use in Library only**

For use in Library only

I-7 v.3  
Jewish Expositor and Friend of Israel

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00314.8089